

# **EXHIBIT A**

H7EPDOYC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 KATE DOYLE, ET AL.,

4 Plaintiffs,

5 v.

17 CV 2542 (KPF)

6 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
7 SECURITY,

8 Defendant.

-----x

New York, N.Y.  
July 14, 2017  
4:08 p.m.

10 Before:

11 HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA,

12 District Judge

13 APPEARANCES

14 CITIZENS FOR RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS IN WASHINGTON  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

15 BY: ANNE L. WEISMANN, ESQ.

16 KNIGHT FIRST AMENDMENT INSTITUTE AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

17 BY: ALEXANDER ABRAHAM ABDO, ESQ.  
18 JAMEEL JAFFER, ESQ.

19 U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, SDNY  
Attorneys for Defendant

20 BY: SARAH SHEIVE NORMAND, ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

21  
22 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, CIVIL DIVISION  
Attorneys for Defendant

23 BY: BRAD P. ROSENBERG, ESQ.

H7EPDOYC

(In open court)

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Good afternoon.  
Thank you for your patience. I understand all of you waited  
outside. I thank you for that also. You may be seated.

(Case called)

MS. WEISMANN: Good afternoon, your Honor. I'm Anne  
Weismann for the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Ms. Weismann, good afternoon. I'm going  
to ask you to stand because I have two monitors that are  
blocking most of your head. Perfect. Thank you very much, and  
Good afternoon to you. Will you be taking the laboring oar  
this afternoon?

MS. WEISMANN: This afternoon, I will, yes, but with  
me is Alex Abdo and Jameel Jaffer.

THE COURT: I'll even let them introduce themselves.

MR. JAFFER: Jameel Jaffer for the Knight First  
Amendment Institute at Columbia University.

MR. ABDO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Alex Abdo.

THE COURT: Thank you, and good afternoon.

MS. NORMAND: Good afternoon, your Honor. Sarah  
Normand from the U.S. Attorney's Office on behalf of the  
defendant.

MR. ROSENBERG: Good afternoon, your Honor. Brad  
Rosenberg from the Department of Justice, Civil Division,  
Federal Programs Branch, also on behalf of the defendant.

H7EPDOYC

1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And as between the two  
2 of you, who should I be directing my questions to?

3 MS. NORMAND: I'll be speaking today, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Thank you. Very much. Ms. Weismann, let  
5 me please begin with you. This is our initial pretrial  
6 conference. I, first of all, welcome all of you this  
7 afternoon. I would like to get a sense what has happened, if  
8 anything, since the lawsuit was filed in April.

9 I do have an understanding of the protocols the  
10 parties would like to use, and the summary judgment motions I  
11 understand completely, but to the extent that there is any  
12 further clarity or perhaps even identification of disputes, I'd  
13 be happy to hear from you.

14 MS. WEISMANN: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. Well, as  
15 our letter reflects --

16 THE COURT: Yes.

17 MS. WEISMANN: -- the parties did talk, pursuant to  
18 this Court's order, and I mean, I think it was an enlightening  
19 discussion not only in terms of process but for the plaintiffs  
20 to learn sort of the universe of documents. We were able to  
21 rule exclude from that, for example, Trump Tower.

22 THE COURT: I saw that, yes.

23 MS. WEISMANN: Knowing that the President had not made  
24 any visits to Trump Tower during the relevant period. We also  
25 were advised that records for Mar-a-Lago would be processed

H7EPDOYC

1 under the Freedom of Information Act, and we did limit -- we  
2 were able to narrow that group, as well, based on the request  
3 of the government, for example, local law enforcement officers  
4 who wanted a photo op with the President, we were happy to  
5 exclude that, as well as certain family members who routinely  
6 would not have shown up in the automated system within the  
7 White House.

8 So that left a body of visitors for which, our  
9 understanding is, the government is in the process of  
10 processing those records and will be releasing to us, I think  
11 it's by September 7th or 8th, all non-exempt records.

12 So as to that group of records, I think the issues  
13 that we will be looking towards possibly litigating further, if  
14 we're not satisfied, would be exemption claims. I can't say at  
15 this point that we will have an issue, for example, as to the  
16 adequacy of the search because we just have no information,  
17 really, hard information, about the kinds of records that  
18 visits to Mar-a-Lago create, except that we know that they are  
19 not the automated records that the White House uses.

20 So I think that leaves what probably will become the  
21 key issue in this case, which is the records that are created,  
22 the automated records WAVES and ACR and other acronyms that are  
23 created when a visitor goes to the White House compound. And  
24 as to those records, the government continues to assert they  
25 are not agency records; they are records of the White House,

H7EPDOYC

1 presidential records and, therefore, subject not subject to the  
2 Freedom of Information Act.

3 THE COURT: And you contest that position?

4 MS. WEISMANN: Yes, we do.

5 THE COURT: Now, I was directed to, or at least it was  
6 called to my attention, the Judicial Watch case from the DC  
7 circuit.

8 MS. WEISMANN: Yes.

9 THE COURT: To be clear, I'm sure your knowledge of  
10 FOIA currently exceeds mine. I hope to get mine up to speed by  
11 the time these motions are filed, but what is different about  
12 this case than was present in that case, or is your view simply  
13 that Judicial Watch was wrongly decided?

14 MS. WEISMANN: Well, some of each, frankly.

15 THE COURT: Please.

16 MS. WEISMANN: So first of all, we do not know  
17 currently what the practices of the Secret Service are. We  
18 don't know if they remain what they were at the time the  
19 Judicial Watch case was litigated, and the primary reason for  
20 that is that, in a separate piece of litigation that I handled  
21 on behalf of CREW, we were able to reach a settlement with the  
22 White House, and that led to the practice that President Obama  
23 put in place for the majority of his term in office, whereby  
24 they voluntarily made the records publicly available every  
25 month.

H7EPDOYC

1 THE COURT: And this was his September 2009 policy?

2 MS. WEISMANN: Correct, and that was in effect until  
3 President Obama left office.

4 THE COURT: May I ask you something? Was it your  
5 sense that that policy played any part in the analysis in  
6 Judicial Watch? I mean, I saw it discussed. I wasn't sure  
7 that it actually entered the calculus, and the reason I'm  
8 asking is it's my understanding that that policy is not today  
9 in effect.

10 MS. WEISMANN: That's correct. I think, at the time  
11 that the Judicial Watch Appellate Court litigation was ongoing,  
12 the policy was very new, and it had not yet been fully  
13 implemented.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MS. WEISMANN: So, you know, we now have the benefit  
16 of all those years of implementation and seven years, or maybe  
17 it's six-and-a-half -- math is not my strong point -- so we  
18 think that could be a critical difference in this case.

19 THE COURT: May I understand why? Let's all be clear.  
20 I know this is our initial pretrial conference. I'm not asking  
21 for the fullest exposition of your arguments, but as I prepare  
22 myself and read up on these cases to make sure that I'm  
23 prepared for this case, I'd be interested in the thoughts that  
24 you have because I'll direct my research accordingly.

25 MS. WEISMANN: Okay. Well, I think that sort of

H7EPDOYC

1 running throughout, and at least a significant theme in the  
2 Judicial Watch decision, is the idea that to otherwise require  
3 the White House to make the visitor logs public would somehow  
4 intrude on, for lack of a better word, the constitutional  
5 prerogatives of the President.

6 There are definitely separation of powers concerns  
7 that seem to have animated Judge Garland's decision, and that's  
8 where I think the experience under the Obama administration,  
9 where these records were made available on a monthly basis and  
10 where there was, as far as we know, there was never any  
11 suggestion that that created any concerns or unduly intruded on  
12 the President or the White House or his staff. So we think  
13 that is a very relevant factor.

14 THE COURT: I see.

15 MS. WEISMANN: And beyond that, though, I mean --

16 THE COURT: You're not suggesting, for example, that  
17 the existence of the policy for six or seven years gave an  
18 entitlement to individuals?

19 MS. WEISMANN: No, we are not. It was a voluntarily  
20 adopted policy. It was not imposed by court order; so we are  
21 not here saying they are bound by a court order and they  
22 violated that, no.

23 THE COURT: Your argument, instead, is if only the DC  
24 circuit had known then what we now know, having impleted this  
25 policy and having seen how it worked and it did work, at least



H7EPDOYC

1 that is your argument, they might have come to a different  
2 decision?

3 MS. WEISMANN: Yes, precisely.

4 THE COURT: I understand. Okay, please continue.

5 MS. WEISMANN: And then beyond that, as Judge Garland  
6 notes in a number of places, where he raises the fact that  
7 parties or we, as the amicus, had challenged some of the  
8 evidence but he says this was decided on summary judgment, so I  
9 have to accept the facts.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MS. WEISMANN: So here we are today, we don't even  
12 know what those factual record will be. We will be waiting for  
13 the government to set that course with its summary judgment  
14 motion, and at that point, we'll have to evaluate -- and this  
15 is also reflected in the letter -- we will be evaluating  
16 whether we need discovery, whether there is other evidence that  
17 we think the Court should be looking at.

18 We understand the 56D now, the proper procedure to do  
19 that, and we've sort of built that into the schedule. So I  
20 don't know that this case will present the identical factual  
21 record as the one before Judge Garland. In fact, I know it  
22 will not because we have the Obama years, where we have that  
23 experience.

24 And then, finally, your Honor, with all due respect to  
25 the DC circuit, I do think they got it wrong. I think he

H7EPDOYC

1 failed to give significant emphasis and meaning to the fact  
2 that these records are created when the Secret Service is  
3 performing one of its core statutory responsibilities,  
4 providing protection to the President, the Vice President and  
5 the White House compound. And I just don't know how you can  
6 start from that and end up saying, nevertheless, the records  
7 that are generated to help them do their job are not Secret  
8 Service records.

9 THE COURT: Okay. So I am understanding that, at some  
10 point, there will be an impasse in this case, that we're having  
11 wonderful discussions right now --

12 MS. WEISMANN: Yes.

13 THE COURT: -- but I cannot --

14 MS. WEISMANN: I can confidentially predict that.

15 THE COURT: Hope springs eternal from this side of the  
16 bench, but I did have the sense that, at some point, we were  
17 going to have some disputes.

18 All right. Anything else that you'd like me to know  
19 at this time?

20 MS. WEISMANN: No, your Honor. Thank you.

21 THE COURT: Thank you very much.

22 Ms. Normand.

23 MS. NORMAND: Thank you, your Honor. I think the  
24 government's position is largely set forth in our letter. We  
25 have been working with the plaintiffs to try to narrow that

H7EPDOYC

1 piece of this case that relates to records that are being  
2 processed under FOIA, and to identify categories of records in  
3 which the plaintiffs are not interested so that the Secret  
4 Service can process the remaining records that are responsive  
5 as expeditiously as possible.

6 We've identified a September 8th proposed deadline for  
7 production of those records and we will, in our summary  
8 judgment motion, which we propose to file at the end of  
9 September, identify the parameters of our search and assert  
10 whatever applicable exemptions there are, assuming that there  
11 remain disputes as to those records.

12 But I do agree with my colleague that the key issue in  
13 this case will be whether the WAVES and ACR records of visitors  
14 to the White House complex are agency records under FOIA. That  
15 is a legal determination that will be based on a record that  
16 the government will put before the Court in detail. We believe  
17 that no discovery will be necessary both because discovery is  
18 generally unavailable in FOIA cases, and because this is  
19 exactly the type of issue that the DC circuit and the DC courts  
20 were able to determine on summary judgment, as in the ordinary  
21 case where the government's declarations are entitled to a  
22 presumption of good faith and are sufficient for a legal  
23 determination on summary judgment.

24 THE COURT: Let me stop you for a moment, please. I  
25 understood you to be saying that, obviously, right now you are

H7EPDOYC

1 working with your agency partners regarding the collection, or  
2 at least the understanding of how these records are kept and  
3 collected, and in what format they exist, correct?

4 MS. NORMAND: Yes, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. I think what I understood  
6 Ms. Weismann to be saying was that she's leaving open the  
7 possibility, in summary judgment practice, of issuing a 56D  
8 notice that more stuff is needed.

9 My question is, is there any way to speak with your  
10 adversary prior to these motions being filed, just so that  
11 there is a sense of what the government did in order to find  
12 these records, in case that possibly staves off some request  
13 for additional discovery or information. I guess my question  
14 is, are there things that could be done pre-motion filing?

15 MS. NORMAND: I would answer that question in two  
16 ways.

17 THE COURT: Yes.

18 MS. NORMAND: With regard to the records of visits to  
19 Mar-a-Lago --

20 THE COURT: Yes.

21 MS. NORMAND: -- I absolutely think that there will be  
22 further discussions between the parties and that they may very  
23 well be fruitful in narrowing issue, potentially even  
24 eliminating disputes as to the scope and adequacy of the search  
25 as to exemptions. I'm being hopeful there as well, but we will

H7EPDOYC

1 certainly have those discussions, and that's part of the reason  
2 why we built in a period of time between producing the records  
3 in early September and ultimately moving for summary judgment  
4 in late September as to that category of records.

5 With regard to the question of WAVES and ACR records,  
6 that is not a question so much of finding out where the records  
7 are. We know where they are. We simply need to develop the  
8 record to explain to the Court why it is, in our view, and as  
9 the court in Judicial Watch found, that those are not agency  
10 records subject to FOIA.

11 And while we can have some discussions with the  
12 plaintiffs, and we will certainly endeavor to do that before  
13 our motion is filed, I think realistically it's likely that our  
14 declarations will still be in the process of being finalized  
15 shortly until that point. So while we can engage in some  
16 discussions with our colleagues, I think it's unlikely that  
17 we'll be able to fully provide the factual basis for our motion  
18 until the motion is filed.

19 That said, however, we built in a substantial period  
20 of time for the purpose of plaintiffs to be able to evaluate  
21 the factual record that the government puts before the Court  
22 and plaintiffs in the motion, for them to be able to evaluate  
23 whether that record is, in their view, sufficient or whether  
24 they want to seek further relief, and then the parties would  
25 potentially discuss and then potentially litigate any further

H7EPDOYC

1 application by the plaintiffs.

2 THE COURT: Is there an analog in the Second Circuit  
3 to Judicial Watch?

4 MS. NORMAND: There isn't. There's no analog.  
5 There's really just a handful of cases that address this issue  
6 at all, and they're all in the District Court.

7 THE COURT: I noticed a few of them in preparing for  
8 this conference, and I was sort of hoping for something more  
9 precedential, one might say, but I understand that.

10 Is it the position of the government that I should  
11 adopt the analysis and the ultimate findings of Judicial Watch,  
12 and then related to that, does the analysis change as a  
13 consequence of the policy that I was discussing with  
14 Ms. Weismann?

15 MS. NORMAND: Nothing does change as a result of that  
16 policy. The institution is a voluntarily policy, and the  
17 withdrawal is a voluntarily policy. It was always, as  
18 Ms. Weismann identified, a voluntary policy adopted by the  
19 administration. The Obama administration always maintained  
20 that these ACR/WAVES records were not agency records under FOIA  
21 and that was why Judicial Watch litigation continued after the  
22 implementation of the voluntary disclosure policy.

23 And so really, they're, in the government's view, very  
24 separate questions. When the Court will be looking at the  
25 government's motion, what we will be attempting to persuade the

H7EPDOYC

1 Court is that, as a matter of law, these records are not agency  
2 records, as Congress intended that category of records, to  
3 define that category of records, and the interim adoption or  
4 withdrawal of a voluntary policy really sheds no light on that.

5 What the Court will need to look at, as the Judicial  
6 Watch court did, was the factual record before the Court about  
7 how the records are created, how they're used, how they're  
8 maintained. Those are going to be the dispositive issues and,  
9 ultimately, we believe the Court will reach the same conclusion  
10 that the DC circuit reached in Judicial Watch.

11 THE COURT: I think I understand from Ms. Weismann is  
12 that a benefit or something that I may now consider with the  
13 implementation of the policy that has since been withdrawn, is  
14 that I may look at it to see whether the things on which the DC  
15 circuit was focused were, in fact, things on which I should  
16 focus.

17 I presume, I imagine, that you're going to tell me  
18 that really, no, nothing has changed, but I think her point is  
19 that the record in this case, just by dint of history, time has  
20 passed, things have happened, will be different from the record  
21 in Judicial Watch, but it is still your position that the  
22 analysis is not going to change?

23 MS. NORMAND: That's right. The record will be  
24 different because we will put before the Court a current  
25 explanation of how these records during the relevant time

H7EPDOYC

1 period were created, used and maintained. We think, if  
2 anything, the record here will be stronger than it was in  
3 Judicial Watch with regard to the critical legal issue of  
4 whether these are agency records.

5 If anything, we think any changes that have occurred  
6 in the management of the system will only strengthen the  
7 government's argument. We don't think that a voluntary policy  
8 of disclosure that was adopted in the interim, while the  
9 government's legal argument with regard to the agency record  
10 question, the statutory question under FOIA, remained the same,  
11 we don't think that that policy really has any bearing  
12 ultimately on what Congress meant by agency records and whether  
13 these records, on the factual record we'll put before the  
14 Court, are agency records as Congress intended that category to  
15 be defined.

16 THE COURT: I think your answer just sort of explained  
17 to me or showed me perhaps a fallacy in my own question, which  
18 is, I am focused on what's happened in the present and the very  
19 recent past, but my sense is that the arguments that persuaded  
20 the DC circuit and the arguments that you are going to be  
21 making to be are much more historical in nature, and I should  
22 be looking to those, you believe, in order to come to the  
23 conclusion that these are agency or not agency records?

24 MS. NORMAND: That's right, your Honor. We think that  
25 to the extent that the DC circuit was looking at the policy



H7EPDOYC

1 questions underlying this, it was looking at those and  
2 attempting to determine what Congress meant when it was  
3 identifying agency records, as the scope of records that are  
4 subject to FOIA.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Now, the parties'  
6 letter to me on July 6th was appropriately detailed, and I  
7 thank you very much for that.

8 Is there any issue that is not raised in this letter  
9 that you want to bring to my attention today because we're  
10 here? We can talk about it. Ms. Weismann, anything else  
11 today?

12 MS. WEISMANN: No.

13 THE COURT: Other than endorsing your schedule, which  
14 I do understand and I intend to do.

15 MS. WEISMANN: No, but if I may respond briefly to a  
16 point that the government raised.

17 THE COURT: Please do.

18 MS. WEISMANN: I think this issue that this Court will  
19 have to decide with respect to the WAVES and ACR records is not  
20 simply a matter of figuring out what Congress intended. I  
21 think it's very clear from every District Court that has  
22 wrestled with this issue, as well as the DC circuit opinion,  
23 that it is a very fact-bound question, and that is why I think  
24 we cannot be confident today that the facts -- you know, what  
25 has happened in the last seven or eight years will have no

H7EPDOYC

1 bearing on that.

2 And if we are able, for example, to test some of those  
3 facts through discovery, if we can convince this Court that  
4 discovery is appropriate, the outcome may be very different  
5 than was before the court in Judicial Watch. As I noted, the  
6 judge said, Judge Garland said in a number of places, you know,  
7 they argue this but my hands are kind of bound because this is  
8 here on summary judgment.

9 We will have an opportunity, we hope, to make sure  
10 that the factual record that this Court has really fills in all  
11 the blanks.

12 THE COURT: I thought I heard Ms. Normand say that  
13 typically in FOIA cases, discovery is not appropriate.

14 MS. WEISMANN: She's correct, but this, I would  
15 submit, is not a typical case.

16 THE COURT: Okay. And tell me why, please.

17 MS. WEISMANN: Because the issue of whether or not  
18 records are agency records or Presidential records is not an  
19 issue that comes up very often, and it is such a fact-bound  
20 question because it really depends on -- you have to look, as  
21 the courts have done, you have to look at how are the records  
22 created, how are they being used, what level of control does  
23 the agency have over them.

24 And I also would point out that in the Judicial Watch  
25 case, those factors were almost in equipoise. I mean, it

H7EPDOYC

1 really was this sort of additional layer that the Court looked  
2 to to sort of push the issue over, to say these are not agency  
3 records because of these constitutional concerns that the court  
4 had, which again, I think the practice of the last six or seven  
5 years has a great deal of bearing on that issue, but I would  
6 submit this is not a typical case.

7 The Mar-a-Lago portion, absolutely, and I agree with  
8 the government's counsel that we will certainly work to at  
9 least narrow, if not eliminate, whatever issues we can. But I  
10 think the status of the other records is a fairly unique issue,  
11 and as I said, I think the facts will play very heavily in the  
12 legal analysis, and that's why we want to make sure that this  
13 Court has the best factual record to make that analysis.

14 THE COURT: I understand. Okay. Anything else today?

15 MS. WEISMANN: No. Thank you.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Normand, anything else today?

17 MS. NORMAND: No, only to say that we will certainly  
18 have arguments to make regarding the discovery question. In  
19 our view, and I think the case law supports it, these FOIA  
20 cases are typically quite fact bound. The issue is that  
21 there's a procedure that the circuit has prescribed for how the  
22 Court resolves the factual issues and makes a legal  
23 determination as to the sufficiency of the government's  
24 showing. We think that while this case is unusual in some  
25 respects, that same process will apply here. We look forward

H7EPDOYC

1 to briefing the issue.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Then I will issue a scheduling  
3 order replicating that sought by the parties. It's my  
4 expectation that the parties are going to adhere to that  
5 schedule, and you'll tell me, but I hope not to hear from you,  
6 that it needs to be changed in any way. I'm imagining that one  
7 of you, if not both of you, will be ordering the transcript.  
8 It's my hope that you do, with whatever speed that you'd like.  
9 Once you do that, I will receive a copy automatically; so  
10 there's no need to send me a courtesy copy. I will get one.  
11 Anything else today?

12 MS. WEISMANN: No, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. I'm keeping you from your weekends.  
14 Thank you very much.

15 MS. WEISMANN: Thank you, your Honor.

16 MS. NORMAND: Thank you, your Honor.

17 (Adjourned)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25